UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-FOURTH SESSION

Official Records

SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE
26th meeting
held on
Tuesday, 11 September 1990
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 26th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. OUDOVENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 28: POLICIES OF APARTHEID OF THE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AFRICA: REQUESTS FOR HEARINGS

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/SPC/44/PV.26
12 September 1990
ENGLISH

90-63003 1105V (E)

best copy available

The meeting was called to order at 11 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 28

POLICIES OF APARTHEID OF THE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AFRICA: REQUESTS FOR HEARINGS (A/SPC/44/3 (reissued), A/SPC/44/4 (reissued), A/SPC/44/5)

The CHAIRMAN: It will be recalled that at the sixth meeting of the sixteenth special session of the General Assembly on "Apartheid and its destructive consequences in southern Africa", held on 14 December 1989, the Assembly decided to re-open item 28, entitled "Policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa" on the agenda of the forty-fourth session in order for the Assembly to resume its session to consider the report of the Secretary-General on the progress made in the implementation of the Declaration on apartheid and its destructive consequences in southern Africa and to consider such activities as may be required, pursuant to decision S-16/24 of 14 December 1989.

Subsequently, at its 95th plenary meeting, on 20 July 1990, the General Assembly decided to meet from 12 to 14 September 1990 in order to consider the report of the Secretary-General, which is contained in document A/44/960 and Add.1, submitted pursuant to its resolution S-16/1 of 14 December 1989.

This morning I wish to bring to the attention of the Committee the letters dated 4, 6 and 7 September 1990 from the President of the General Assembly to the Chairman of the Special Political Committee, which are being distributed as documents A/SPC/44/3, A/SPC/4 and A/SPC/44/5.

The letter of 4 September (A/SPC/44/3) reads as follows:

"I have the honour to enclose a letter, dated 28 August 1990, addressed to me by the Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid, indicating that he has received several requests from non-governmental organizations wishing to be heard in the Special Political Committee at the time when the Assembly will resume its consideration of the report of the Secretary-General

(The Chairman)

on the 'Progress made in the implementation of the Declaration on Apartheid and its Destructive Consequences in Southern Africa'.

"In this connexion I should like to recall that the Assembly, at its third plenary meeting, decided that item 28 (Policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa) should be considered directly in plenary meeting, 'on the understanding that ... organizations and individuals having a special interest in the question would be permitted to be heard by the Special Political Committee'. In the light of that decision, I would appreciate it if you could convene a meeting of the Special Political Committee on 11 September 1990.

"The list of organizations and individuals that have expressed the desire to be heard by the Special Political Committee will be transmitted to you as soon as it is received."

The subsequent letters of 6 and 7 September 1990 (A/SPC/44/4 and A/SPC/44/5) provide the names of non-governmental organizations and individuals who have expressed the desire to be heard by the Special Political Committee. I have been informed that Mr. Abdul Minty of the World Campaign against Military and Nuclear Collaboration with South Africa, whose name is included in document A/SPC/44/4, is unable to come. The other names are: Mrs. Jennifer Davis of the American Committee on Africa, Mr. Magnus Walan of the Africa Groups of Sweden; Isolate South Africa Committee, Mr. Boji Jordan of the American-South African Peoples' Friendship Association, Mr. Ahmed Obafemi of New African Peoples' Organization, Mr. David Brothers - but Mr. Sekou Nkrumah will speak on his behalf - of the All-African Peoples' Revolutionary Party, and Mr. Lennox Hinds of the International Association of Democratic Lawyers.

I propose that the Committee approve the requests for hearing contained in the annex to documents A/SPC/44/4 and A/SPC/44/5.

In addition, I have just received requests from observers of the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) and the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania

(The Chairman)

(PAC) to be called upon to address the Special Committee. They spoke in the Ad Hoc Committee of the last special session of the General Assembly on apartheid. Hence, if the Special Committee does not object, we shall add the names of the two representatives of the ANC and the PAC, who will speak as well.

If there are no objections to this proposal, it will be so decided

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: I should now like to raise the question of verbatim coverage for the hearings. I wish to propose that, following the practice of previous years, the Special Committee request verbatim records of the hearings. This is a normal working procedure, and if there are no objections, it will be so decided.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like sincerely to welcome the representatives of non-governmental organizations who are present and to remind them that our time for this meeting is limited to 1 p.m. Hence this circumstance will have to be taken into consideration by speakers.

I wish also to appeal to speakers - and this is very important - to speak slowly and to make their statements at a speed that will enable the interpreters to keep pace with the delivery and facilitate the task of the verbatim reporters and press officers. My experience is that representatives of non-governmental organizations speak rather fast. We may just have to listen but interpreters are doing their job at the same time; they are unique people: they are listening and at the same time speaking. I therefore appeal to all speakers to take this into consideration also.

The first speaker is Mrs. Jennifer Davis of the American Committee on Africa, on whom I now call.

Mrs. DAVIS: Mr. Chairman, I should like to thank you and the Special Committee for the opportunity to address the Special Committee at this very critical moment, when the people of South Africa stands at a vital crossroad.

The first real signs of change are emerging in South Africa today. Change is coming, but how quickly and how extensively is still not clear, the stirring events of the past few months - the release of Nelson Mandela and some other political prisoners, the return of the first political exiles and the unbanning of political organizations - have all given hope that real change may finally be on the horizon.

But even as the Government begins talks with the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) in the capital, in the townships and the rural areas they are still arresting, torturing and killing local activists. For example, in Empangeni, in northern Natal trade unions activists and ANC local organizers are being burned out of their homes by groups affiliated with Kwa Zulu bantustan leader Gatsha Buthelezi - and that was confirmed for us last week by a member of our staff who had spent three or four weeks this summer travelling around South Africa.

READEX FICHE

(Mrs. Davis)

In the Johannesburg area Inkatha supporters are being used by the South African Government as shock troops in their war against township-based anti-apartheid organizers. As many here are aware, for more than 40 years the Nationalist Party has pursued a deliberate divide-and-rule policy in the black community that has included attempts to divide townships into ethnic or tribal areas. Single-sex hostels for migrant workers were separated and isolated from the rest of the community. The State's vicious political manipulation of such groups is not new. It will be recalled, for example, that during the 1976 Soweto uprising for a time the Government successfully was able to use the divisions it had created to unleash the hostel residents on protesting students in an attempt to undermine township organizing. Tragically, this deliberate government policy continues, with terrible consequences for the people.

We are particularly disturbed by the mounting evidence - from eyewitness reports, from the churches and from credible monitoring groups, such as the Independent Board of Inquiry into Informal Repression - that the South African policy have actively aided and fanned the violence in the townships surrounding Johannesburg which this past August claimed more than 500 lives. Nobody who knows the activities of the South African police will be surprised at this, but I think it is important to stress that this disturbing behaviour continues despite all the conciliatory talk that we are hearing. Thus, as recently as last Sunday, South African Council of Churches leader, Frank Chikane, said again that "police are involved in killing us".

In a statement on 5 September 24 Anglican bishops from throughout southern Africa declared that:

"the police, as currently constituted and trained, are often a force which sparks off violence, rather than keeps the peace in situations of conflict."

(Mrs. Davis)

The bishops issued a call of the greatest urgency for the State President to bring the police and the South African defence forces under control.

I now turn to the question of the negotiations climate. The United Nations Declaration last December called for the creation of a climate conducive to negotiations. We believe that this climate has not yet been created. The African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) has agreed to a cease-fire, but as noted above, the Government seems unwilling to do its part to halt the violence.

The December Declaration specifically called for: first, the unconditional release of political prisoners and detainees; secondly, an end to the bans on political organizations and individuals; thirdly, the removal of troops from the townships; fourthly, an end to the state of emergency and repeal of legislation designed to circumscribe political activity; and fifthly, an end to political trials and executions.

The South African Government, as far as we can see, has complied fully with only one of the five conditions set out by the United Nations as necessary for the creation of a climate conducive to negotiations: they have unbanned political organizations. There is not enough space here to review progress on meeting all of these conditions, but I should like to make two specific points.

Although agreement has been reached for the release of political prisoners and detainees, thousands still remain in gaol and the Human Rights Centre reports that:

"the courts are working overtime to manufacture a new stream of political prisoners".

The consensus resolution also called for the lifting of the state of emergency and the repeal of repressive legislation. The Government's lifting of the emergency in all areas but Natal last June was an important step, but it would be a mistake to welcome this partial measure when the emergency remains in effect in

(Mrs. Davis)

Natal and, in effect, mini-emergencies were reimposed through the declaration of so-called unrest areas in 27 townships and 19 magisterial districts around Johannesburg only this August. Furthermore, security legislation, such as the Internal Security Act of 1982, the Public Safety Act of 1953, or the Public Safety Amendment Act of 1986, and many other such pieces of legislation, remain in place. I would add, purely from our own personal experience with the weekly television news programme South Africa Now, which we sponsor, that we can see the South African State continuing its censorship by many means. Thus, this week South African Now's producer was refused a visa to visit South Africa. So the censorship continues.

With regard to the question of evidence of irreversible change, in our view, the other critical part of the December resolution was the call for the international community not to relax existing sanctions measures until "there is clear evidence of profound and irreversible change". There is, in our view, no evidence of such change in South Africa at this date. This view is supported by the South African Council of Churches in a resolution they adopted in July at their national conference.

The South African Council of Churches declared that the dismantling of apartheid will be irreversible only when the following conditions are met: first, a Constituent Assembly is constituted; secondly, sovereign power is removed from the existing legislative structures and invested either in the Constituent Assembly or another agreed interim structure; and, thirdly, the white minority cannot legally reverse or veto the process of change through the present unrepresentative legislative structures. These conditions were subsequently endorsed by the internal leadership of the African National Congress at a meeting this August.

We believe that this position would be a useful refinement of the United Nations Declaration and we would encourage representatives to consider adoption of

(Mrs. Davis)

such a position at the forthcoming session of the General Assembly. Such action is particularly important in the context of recent actions by Member States that suggest that some may be contemplating lifting sanctions pressures before there has in fact been such irreversible change.

The actions of the British Government in unilaterally lifting some sanctions, and recent indications from the Federal Republic of Germany and the Dutch Government that they are considering relaxing some measures are, in our view, serious breaches of the international consensus.

And, indeed, the recent announcement by the United States President, George Bush, that he would be meeting with South African State President F. W. De Klerk in September is also a serious violation of the spirit of the December Declaration. This would be the first such State visit by a South African Government leader since the Nationalist Party was elected on its apartheid platform in 1948. De Klerk's visit was first scheduled for this past June but was canceled after an outpouring of opposition from members of Congress and the American public. We believe similar public pressure should be brought to bear to prevent the 24 September meeting between President Bush and De Klerk.

At the local level in the United States, the American public is continuing to work to isolate apartheid with none of the same hesitations that seem to confront our policy makers in Washington. Since Mr. Mandela's visit last June, new stronger local sanctions legislation has been passed in New York City, Detroit and Chicago, and similar legislation is being considered in local communities throughout the United States.

As part of this effort, the National Conference of Mayors in the United States has adopted a resolution demanding that sanctions remain in place until there is democracy in South Africa. This resolution, as part of a national campaign

(Mrs. Davis)

initiated by our associated organization, the Africa Fund, has also been supported by four of our largest trade union organizations in the United States, among them the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), the United Auto Workers and the United Mine Workers of America. Moreover, thousands of Americans have individually endorsed this demand.

These resolutions are particularly important, we feel, because the essence of the struggle in South Africa is the struggle for democracy. As the drafters of the United Nations Declaration realized last December, the people of South Africa are not simply fighting to end apartheid, they are fighting to establish democracy.

The United Nations Declaration called for a new constitutional order determined by the people of South Africa. The ANC, the Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU) and the mass democratic movement have all declared that the best process for achieving this end would be through elections for a Constituent Assembly that would draft the new Constitution. How else would all South Africans have a fair and equitable say in drafting their new Government?

(Mrs. Davis)

Yet even as De Klerk's Government would have us believe that it has accepted the need for change his ministers are continuing to try and subvert this essential part of the process. The Nationalist Government has repeatedly rejected calls for an elected constituent assembly, arguing instead that all political organizations with a proven support base should be included in a consensus body. On what basis would the Government propose to determine the support base of South Africans?

In the Assembly's meetings later this week I urge it to place its support firmly behind the only process that can ensure that the South African people are the drafters of the next constitution, and that is an elected constituent assembly. Anything short of that would be a betrayal of the South African people and would contradict the essence of the resolution adopted last year.

In closing, let me reaffirm our commitment to continue to maintain pressure on the apartheid régime until such time as the process has become irreversible. Keep the pressure on.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on Mr. Boji Jordan of the American-South African Peoples' Friendship Association.

Mr. JORDAN: Allow me to express the gratitude and appreciation of the American-South African Peoples' Friendship Association for this invitation to make a statement before the Special Political Committee on the current situation in racist South Africa.

The opening of the preamble of our Association's Pledge reads:

"We will work in all ways to create and express support between the peoples of South Africa and the United States. We join with all oppressed South Africans from all walks of life in calling for the right to determine their own future. We call for an end to exploitation and racism."

(Mr. Jordan)

Let me hasten to address the present political morass in that God-forsaken racist enclave. First, the so-called black-on-black feud which has so far cost about 600 lives in less than a month is a direct creation of the racist régime in its divide-and-rule manoeuvring tactics. The racist Government has been secretly and openly arming one group, Nkata, to provoke and attack the opponents of the régime. They have been playing one ethnic group against another by segregating them in different residential hostels and thereafter offering them differing treatment in the areas of job categories, living conditions and social benefits so as to create enmity and jealousy among them, thereby shifting the blame from the white racist authorities, where it belongs.

The overcrowding, squalour, poverty and unemployment that prevail wherever blacks are confined are ready outlets for latent antagonism to explode. We join with the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC), which was the first liberation movement to call on the warring parties to sit down at the table as compatriots, brothers and sisters, to iron out whatever differences there were, real and imaginary, even before the havoc of killing one another moved from Natal to the Transvaal.

The Government of the day must do away with the system of ethnic polluted hostels where they crowd migrant workers like sardines into a residential setting. There tensions are on edge and ready to burst into riotous violent expression at the first opportunity to vent their frustrations following years of oppression, exploitation and homesickness. The hostel situation is but one aspect of the apartheid racist system which has worked against the harmonious development of blacks in South Africa. Real changes must take place.

We view De Klerk's invitation to blacks to join the ruling all-white Nationalist Party as another ploy to dupe the people into hanging themselves. Almost all the laws that strangle the black people of Azania into nothingness were

(Mr. Jordan)

put into place by the Nationalist Party since its ascent to power in 1948, and they have been kept in place to this very day, this very moment by that same Nationalist Party. And that monster politician De Klerk expects the oppressed people of Azania to join openly in their own oppression! How politically arrogant and insulting can a racist be? Those whom the gods would destroy they first make mad.

On negotiations, we say not yet. Whilst we agree there should be negotiations about the mechanisms for establishing a unitary, non-racial constituent assembly on the basis of one person, one vote to draw up a democratic constitution for a new Azania/South Africa, the time is certainly not ripe or conducive to such negotiations yet, so long as the following pillars of oppression still stand; these must be uncompromisingly removed, as they are non-negotiable. They are: first, the 1913 and 1936 Land Acts, which gave 87 per cent of the richest part of the land to the minority white settlers, now numbered at 5 million, and gave 13 per cent of the poorest barren land to the majority blacks, now numbered at 30 million - the Group Areas Act is based on those allotments; secondly, the Population Registration Act, which classifies and categorizes people according to their colour and ethnic origin; thirdly, so-called bantu education, which stipulates that Africans must be given inferior education to prepare them for service under white settlers; fourthly, the tricameral parliamentary system, which recognizes 178 whites in the Assembly, 85 "coloureds" in the House of Representatives and 45 Asians in the House of Deputies as the legitimate law-makers for the whole population of Azania, but which specifically excludes the majority Africans.

The PAC and the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) have been unbanned, but over 30 million people are still denied the right to vote because of the colour of their skin. Protesters are still being shot in the streets. Hundreds of political prisoners still languish in apartheid gaols. Opponents of apartheid are still liable to imprisonment under fearsome security laws.

(Mr. Jordan)

The entire political system is still as killing to us as it was on 2 February 1990, when De Klerk announced the new reform programme and released Nelson Mandela.

The fifth pillar of oppression which must be removed involves the so-called bantustans, a balkanization of the country whereby Africans are separated into "tribal groups" and placed on desert-like strips of land to act out a slave existence.

(Mr. Jordan)

This is just more of the "keep-them-divided-and-we-will-keep-them-conquered" mentality of the whites. We agree with the Pan Africanist Congress that those five demands are non-negotiable. Freedom, as a matter of fact, should be non-negotiable. You either have it or you do not. It is only for political exigencies that certain aspects of it, like the mechanisms we mentioned earlier, have to negotiated.

In conclusion we wish to implore the Committee to view its support for the liberation movements with special scrutiny at this point in time. We note with approval and admiration that the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania has not suspended or abandoned the armed struggle. Why should they, when the Boers are in fact intensifying the use of weapons for their wives, children and even servants? We call upon the United Nations and freedom-minded support groups to pour funds on the only remaining armed-struggle proponents in Azania.

It must also be noted that at no time in the past, or in the present, has the PAC ever been involved in any of the factional fighting inside racist South Africa. Instead, it has continuously and uncompromisingly called upon all the forces that have a contradiction with the racist régime to form a united patriotic front. For this, and for its refusal to abandon the armed struggle, we salute the PAC for being true to the words of their leader and founder, Mangaliso Sobukwe, who said:

> "We will not retreat! We will not compromise! We will not relent! We will not equivocate! And we will be heard!"

The struggle continues! The Land is ours!

The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon Mr. Sekou Nkrumah, who represents the All-African Peoples' Revolutionary Party.

Mr. NKRUMAH: Permit me, on behalf of the All-African Peoples' Revolutionary Party, to express our sincere gratitude to you f r affording our Party the honour of making our humble contribution to humanity. Today, once again, we want to put the destruction of this pigsty of the world, apartheid, into its proper historical context, the African Revolution, and to expose the true character and nature of the illegal, racist, garrison, settler apartheid régime of South Africa.

This session of the Special Political Committee has been convened at an extremely important juncture in the world revolutionary process in general and in the Pan-African movement, the revolutionary struggle for the total liberation and unification of Africa under scientific socialism, in particular.

African people have been struggling relentlessly for more than 500 years against the diabolical forces of European imperialism and foreign domination. After several centuries of slavery and the slave trade in the late nineteenth century European imperialism imposed a series of colonies throughout the length and breadth of our beloved homeland. Our people resisted continually and sought more powerful means of struggle. At the fifth Pan-African Congress, convened in Manchester, England, in 1945, it was decided that the African masses should always be the central force in our liberation struggle. Thus, the anti-colonial struggle was launched in mass organized form, with political parties and in a mass movement spreading like wildfire throughout Africa and the Diaspora. Consequently, as of this year, the anti-colonial movement is marking 45 years of struggle.

More than 50 European colonies dominated the landscape of our beloved homeland in 1945. Today, we are in fact faced with only one retrogressive, reactionary settler régime, South Africa. Defenders of truth, South Africa is the last European colony in Africa. In this area of our homeland the African masses have been fighting against brutal foreign domination for more than 300 years.

(Mr. Nkrumah)

As revolutionaries we seek guidance from the laws produced out of our experience of struggle. The history of the African decolonization process and the even broader world anti-imperialist struggle demonstrates that no colonizer or oppressor voluntarily cedes power to the colonized or the oppressed. As Dr. Osagyefo Kwame Nkrumah teaches us:

> "The privileged will not, unless compelled to, surrender power. They may grant reforms but will not yield an inch when the basic pillars of their entrenched position are threatened."

As an example, Osagyefo's wisdom is confirmed by the history of the African anti-colonial struggle in the area where European colonialism has been anchored by the European settlers. In Kenya the Mau Mau movement had to resort to fire and blood to break the stranglehold of British settlers. In Algeria our heroic people sacrificed more than one million lives in an 8-year battle to dislodge a reactionary French settler minority and its imperialist masters from power. More recently we know that the almighty masses waged 16 years of armed struggle to destroy the settler minority régime of Ian Smith and create a liberated Zimbabwe under the leadership of the Patriotic Front. In light of those facts we have no reason to believe that the most retrogressive, brutal, reactionary and entrenched settler minority régime in the history of Africa will voluntarily return the stolen land and usurped political power to the oppressed African masses in Azania-South Africa, the only rightful owners of the land and rulers of the country.

Strugglers for justice, as the beast in Pretoria smiles through the newly donned mask of reform and compromise, the monster's fangs still drip with the blood of our people. For example, State-sponsored and fomented violence among the oppressed African masses has resulted in the death of more than 500 innocent men, women and children in the townships during the last several weeks.

(Mr. Nkrumah)

The illegal racist garrison of South Africa has clearly embarked on a new, escalated and even more massive imperialist offensive against the masses of people living and struggling in Azania-South Africa and the Governments in southern Africa and Africa as a whole.

(Mr. Nkrumah)

The objectives, strategies and policies of the apartheid Government of South Africa are crystal clear: first, to liquidate the national liberation struggle, which genuinely represents the aspirations of the oppressed African masses. The legal régime is doing that by splitting and pitting the legitimate organizations of the movement against each other and isolating, incarcerating, and outright murdering revolutionary elements. The racist minority Government is obstructing mass organization and sponsoring so-called ethnic or political violence campaigns among the oppressed African masses, resulting in chaos. There is also the imposition of the state of emergency actions, mass arrests and detention, house-by-house searches, and break-up of meetings with large troop deployments and/or intelligence agents occupying the townships. Currently, there are over 3,000 political prisoners in South African gaols.

The second is to impose a settler-controlled, neo-colonial or power-sharing arrangements into the political vacuum created by neutralization of the genuine national liberation movement through manipulating the reform process as well as orchestrating the campaign of overt and covert terror.

The third is the purposeful arming of the reactionary white right-wing in the country.

The fourth is the termination of the front-line States, ultimately trying to reduce their Governments to client States through a campaign of political intimidation, economic extortion, subversion, and proxy wars such as overt and covert support for the outlaw bandits RENAMO in Mozambique and UNITA in Angola. The legal racist minority settler régime is also holding the people of Namibia hostage by refusing to cede Walvis Bay to the Namibian Government.

The fifth is to use the vast political and diplomatic resources of world imperialism, especially the United States of America, Britain and Israel, to coerce the world community into giving approval to the bogus power-sharing arrangement.

(Mr. Nkrumah)

The sixth is to manipulate world public opinion through the power of the imperialist-Zionist controlled media to portray the settler colonial régime as reform-minded, legitimate partners in a new South Africa, to win acceptance of their puppets as authentic African leaders and to brand the genuine nationalist forces as fringe extremist and terrorist elements.

The seventh is the ruthless intimidation and nuclear whitemail of Africa and the rest of the world. Israel and the United States have given the most racist, reactionary, brutal and illegal settler colony in the world nuclear weapons. Those weapons are aimed at the whole of Africa and the rest of humanity.

The eighth is the intensification of the ties and joint co-operation between the illegal racist settler régimes of South Africa and Israel, and the United States. In our analysis, we have seen no signs of meaningful change. There has only been delaying and divisive manoeuvres and weakening the genuine national liberation movements and maintaining political and economic power. Our Party cannot and will not yield to the perennial robber, who offers scraps of the loot to maintain the lion's share of the stolen booty, to deal justly with the robbed.

On the contrary, we look only to the resilience of the disenfranchised victims who are waging a just struggle for national liberation and a better way of life. To measure progress in the struggle, to dismantle this decaying colonialism, we believe that all freedom-loving humanity must focus on the information presented by the oppressed, not the oppressor.

In that light, the international community has a moral responsibility to increase pressure in all its forms, including economic sanctions on the bandit régime until the stolen land and usurped power is repossessed by the oppressed African masses. Further, we reaffirm our total support for the oppressed African masses under the leadership of the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) and the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC), as well as other revolutionary

(Mr. Nkrumah)

forces for our just struggle to smash the illegal immoral settler colonial régime, to build a liberated Azania-South Africa under indigenous rule. Here, we call for a united front under the leadership and the ANC and the PAC as a strategic necessity at this stage of the national liberation struggle.

While the enemy attempts to weaken us, revolutionary logic in the interests of our suffering masses compels us to unite, thereby accelerating our march to ultimate victory. Additionally, we call for the radical intensification of all forms of struggle, including armed struggle. Dr. Kwame Nkrumah says:

> "As long as violence continues to be used against the African people, the Party cannot achieve its objectives without the use of all forms of political struggle, including armed struggle."

We of the All-African Peoples' Revolutionary Party who hold firm our ideology, Nkrumahism-Tureism and our objective Pan-Africanism feel confident that victory is inevitable for the African masses in the struggle against direct European colonialism, foreign domination and imperialism. We know that a liberated Azania-South Africa will be a major victory in our people's 500-year struggle for the complete emancipation and redemption that can only be realized in one unified, socialist Africa. All land and power to the oppressed African masses of Azania-South Africa. We thank you and as always we stand ready for the revolution.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on Mr. Magnus Walan of the Africa Groups of Sweden; Isolate South Africa Committee.

Mr. WALAN: I would like to thank the United Nations Special Political Committee and the United Nations Special Committee against Apartheid for giving us the opportunity to speak here. I speak here also on behalf of the South Africa Committee, Denmark; the Isolate South Africa Campaign in Finland; and the Norwegian Council for Southern Africa in Norway.

(Mr. Walan)

The Nordic anti-apartheid movements have with great interest studied the report from the Secretary-General on the progress of the December resolution. We were also very pleased that the resolution was adopted by consensus. The situation in South Africa has changed. There are signs that the apartheid rule is moving towards its end. But it is the long struggles of the people in southern Africa, together with the international sanctions, that have led to the moves taken by the De Klerk Government. It is therefore invalid to propose that the régime should be rewarded for that by lifting any sanctions in any form. It is the democratic movement under the leadership of the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) that should be rewarded for those changes.

We agree with the Secretary-General's report that the policies of F.W. De Klerk have opened up possibilities for the dismantling of apartheid. But the laws that underpin apartheid remain on the statute books and are still being implemented.

The United Nations Declaration also called for the creation of a climate conducive to negotiation. In that regard, we would like to point out that there are numerous repressive laws still in place that are being widely used, including the Internal Security Act, the Public Safety Act, and the Public Safety Amendment Act. According to human rights lawyers, there are more than 100 laws that restrict the free flow of information in South Africa. According to the Human Rights Commission in South Africa, some 800 people have been detained for political reasons in South Africa during the first 8 months of this year. We are especially concerned by the arrest of the leading ANC members Mack Marrai and Billy Nair, and by the withdrawal of the indemnity of Chris Harney, Mack Marrai and Ronny Castrels, all members of the ANC national executive.

(Mr. Walan)

This we see as something in direct contradiction of what the Government has committed itself to in the talks with the ANC and also in talks with the United Nations representatives.

These are just examples of the De Klerk Government's failure to create a climate for the free political activity that the United Nations resolution called for. And there are still more than 2,000 political prisoners in South Africa today.

We are also very disturbed by the mounting evidence of police spearheading attacks with Inkatha on pro-ANC communities in the Johannesburg area recently, attacks that have left more than 600 people dead. Inkatha is an organization built around the system of the homeland Kwazulu. The homeland system is one of the pillars of apartheid. Inkatha is therefore in our view an apartheid organization, and certainly there are both black and white groups that do not want to see a united, democratic and non-racial South Africa.

The main responsibility for the violence and the more than 600 dead must be given to the police and the South African Government.

The situation remains far from the free political climate the United Nations resolution called for before real negotiation could start. Therefore we are very far from talking about clear evidence of profound and irreversible changes, of the dismantling of apartheid, which the resolution required before the international community could consider relaxing sanctions on South Africa.

Until that situation has come, South Africa should not be accepted in any form, either in the United Nations or by the international community. We must therefore condemn those countries, including Britain, that have removed or relaxed sanctions, and urge those countries considering lifting or relaxing sanctions to support the democratic movement and the United Nations demand that sanctions should continue.

(Mr. Walan)

The Nordic countries decided jointly in March this year to change their guidelines for visas for South Africans. It was said that the new visa regulation should support dialogue and the process for democracy.

As anti-apartheid movements, we are critical of the outcome of this change. There are a number of cases of South Africans receiving visas who are definitely not part of the broad anti-apartheid movement. There are even examples of representatives of the apartheid State that have been given visas. We also insist that the ANC and the democratic movement should be consulted in these cases.

It is also the broad democratic movement under the leadership of the ANC that must decide when the situation is irreversible.

We also support the idea that the United Nations could formally support the definition adopted by the South African Council of Churches for determining when the process of dismantling apartheid is irreversible, as we just heard from Jennifer Davis, a policy that was adopted by the National Congress in June.

But our support for the struggle for a democratic South Africa does not end with the question of sanctions. When we are asked to lift sanctions, we must increase other forms of support for the ANC and the democratic movement, especially when the ANC has suspended its armed struggle. It is likely that the ANC will be the leader of a broad front in an election to a constitutional assembly.

On the other side, one can expect some kind of front with the Nationalist Party in the leadership that continues to stick to the concept of minority rights or group rights. We see that concept as a new form of apartheid.

Therefore the Nordic Anti-Apartheid Movement will continue to support the democratic movement under the leadership of the ANC in various forms as long as apartheid exists.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on Mr. Eora Ebrahim, of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania.

Mr. EBRAHIM: Mr. Chairman, at the outset may I on behalf of the Pan Africanist Congress express my gratitude to you for exercising your democratic right and allowing me to make a brief statement on behalf of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania. I had no doubt whatsover as to your ability to do so, and I am glad that you have succeeded.

I think everyone in this chamber is aware of the fact that internal resistance, including the armed struggle and international isolation, as well as the imposition of selective and voluntary sanctions, led to the situation that we are now witnessing in apartheid South Africa, namely the racist régime attempting to come out as a reformer. But the United Nations, Africa and in particular the people of Azania have always said, and continue to maintain, that apartheid cannot be reformed; it must be totally and completely eradicated.

In the recent months we have had two important Declarations adopted, namely the Harare Declaration and the United Nations consensus resolution, which, as the Committee is aware, have laid down certain procedures and principles according to which the international community should support the people in our country who are waging a very principled and relentless struggle to eradicate the apartheid system. The two documents give three stages of development in the country, but before dealing with that I wish to emphasize one very important fact, namely that as of now what is being discussed both internally and internationally is not the question of negitiations but the creation of a conducive climate for negotiations in apartheid South Africa. That is the present stage.

The Harare Declaration and the United Nations resolution have stipulated very categorically that there are certain preconditions which the régime must meet in

(Mr. Ebrahim, PAC)

order to create the conducive climate for a negotiated settlement in apartheid South Africa. The preconditions that have been laid down are: first, the unbanning of the organizations inside the country; second, the release of political prisoners unconditionally; third, the lifting of the state of emergency; fourth, the withdrawal of the troops from the township; and, fifth, the unconditional return of political exiles. Those are the preconditions the racist régime was required to meet in order to create the conducive climate for a negotiated settlement in apartheid South Africa.

We of the Pan Africanist Congress would like to emphasize here that going through the five preconditions it should be noted that these five preconditions in no way deal with the pillars of apartheid. They are merely the reaction of the régime to the resistance of the people in the country, and therefore what the five preconditions merely state is that the régime must withdraw its reaction, and in many respects go back to the pre-21 March 1960 situation in apartheid South Africa.

The Secretary-General's report, as well as the report compiled by the monitoring group of the ad hoc committee of the Organization of African Unity have well documented that the preconditions for climate laid down by the international community together with the people in Azania have not yet been met. Of the five preconditions, only one has been met, namely the unbanning of the organizations. There has been a partial acceptance of the state of emergency, in that it has been removed in the three other provinces, except in the troubled province of Natal.

(Mr. Ebrahim, PAC)

There has been the release of some political prisoners but the vast majority remain incarcerated in apartheid South Africa. There has been no attempt to give amnesty to political exiles, and there has been no attempt whatsoever to remove the racist troops from the African townships.

We also wish to emphasize here that what the régime has been attempting to do in the process is to turn the pre-conditions which the racist régime was required to meet unconditionally in order to create a conducive climate into negotiating issues. They now say that we must come and negotiate the release of political prisoners. They want us to agree to categorize political prisoners in apartheid South Africa. We must agree on those that must be released and those that must remain incarcerated in apartheid South Africa.

The view of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC) is that the international community and our people demand the unconditional release of all political prisoners. Therefore, we reject the categorization of political prisoners in our country. The other important aspect with regard to this is that any attempt on the part of any liberation movement to enter into the exercise of categorizing political prisoners can result in one thing and one thing only, and that is division within the liberation movement itself. Therefore, we reject outright the question of categorizing political prisoners in our country. We also reject the question of turning the pre-conditions into negotiating issues, which the racist régime is attempting to do.

We say that the Harare Declaration and the United Nations resolution, when calling for the creation of a conducive climate in our country, indicated that there should be three stages: first, the unconditional implementation of the pre-conditions. Once those pre-conditions have been unconditionally implemented

(Mr. Ebrahim, PAC)

and a conducive climate created, we can then move on, as is stated in the two documents, to the next stage, namely, to work towards an agreed mutual cessation of hostilities.

The PAC rejects the question of the unilateral suspension or abandonment of the legitimacy of our struggle, as well as the legitimate form of that struggle, the armed struggle. It can only agree to a mutual cessation of hostilities, as called for in the Harare Declaration and the United Nations resolution.

Following that, the PAC maintains, as is also stated in the two documents, that what has to be negotiated in apartheid South Africa is not apartheid, not the pillars of apartheid, but rather the new Constitution, and we maintain that the new Constitution can only be drawn up by elected representatives. Consequently, the PAC has put forward a document clearly stating how the Constituent Assembly ought to be formed in the country. In keeping with the requirements of the United Nations resolution, we are saying that the first stage should be voter registration based on one person one vote on a common voter's roll, and then the election of a Constituent Assembly, and it is only this Constituent Assembly that can claim to be truly representative and to have a mandate to draw up the new Constitution for a democratic, united and free Azania.

So those are the three stages that we feel the meeting should take into consideration: first the unconditional implementation of the pre-conditions, then a mutually agreed cessation of hostilities, and subsequently the establishment of a Constituent Assembly based on one person one vote on a common voter's roll.

In the meantime, until those points are agreed upon, we maintain, as our people do, that all forms of pressure against apartheid South Africa, that is internal resistance, including the armed struggle, international political

(Mr. Ebrahim, PAC)

isolation, as well as the various forms of sanctions applied against the régime, should be maintained and sustained.

May I now take the opportunity of briefing the meeting here about the current developments in our country in which the PAC is involved. Prior to the unbanning of the PAC we created a number of organizations and structures inside the country. For instance, we established inside the country during the period in which we were banned the following domocratic structures: a youth organization, a students' organization, a women's organization, trade union movements, a black lawyers' association, and a media workers' association.

In order to co-ordinate the activities of these organizations, in December last year we formed what was known as the Pan Africanist Movement. The Pan Africanist Movement inside the country was the co-ordinating body of all the mass structures that we had created inside the country. In other words, the unbanning of the Pan Africanist Congress in particular inside the country on 2 February was merely a de jure recognition of a de facto situation that had already prevailed in the country. Therefore, it made no difference to us, because all we did within a period of two weeks was hold a congress of the Pan Africanist Movement, which was then able to convert itself into the Pan Africanist Congress Internal, and that is the organization that is now heading the internal wing of the Pan Africanist Congress.

We have utilized the period during which we have been unbanned to consolidate the various structures inside the country, and we can now say that we have already opened between 120 and 136 branches, offices and regions inside the country.

In order to expand our work, we also organized on 7 and 8 July the Congress of the Oppressed inside the country, which was attended by more than 2,000 delegates from all over the country. The aims of the Congress of the Oppressed were

(Mr. Ebrahim, PAC)

twofold: the first was to create a forum within our country for all the oppressed to be able to work out a common position and a common strategy against the common enemy, and we must say that it was a success in that regard.

The second purpose of the Congress of the Oppressed was to work out a common policy that we should pursue, and the three stages that are contained in the Harare Declaration and the United Nations resolution, namely, the question of the pre-conditions being met unconditionally, a mutual cessation of hostilities, and the concept of a Constituent Assembly were in fact supported at the Congress. We intend to convene more such meetings in our country in the near future.

May I also say something about the violence that is now occurring in our country. In this regard, we wish to point out first and foremost that the PAC is in no way directly involved in the senseless carnage that is taking place at this particular time in our country. That, however, does not mean that we are not concerned with the killings that are going on and the violence that is being perpetrated inside the country.

We of the PAC have made a detailed study of the violence and we have come up with the following conclusions: first and foremost, this is the direct result of the apartheid policies practised in our country. The aim of the régime in creating bantustans, as was stated earlier by the PAC, was fundamentally to revive tribalism and, to an extent, in creating the KwaZulu homeland, the racist régime has succeeded in the creation of a tribal entity within the country.

(Mr. Ebrahim, PAC)

Also, the régime then allowed the leader of the KwaZulu homeland also to appoint himself Minister of Police and use that portfolio to negotiate with the régime for arms to give the police force in the KwaZulu homeland; this is also a contributory factor to the violence in our country. In that regard, we can say that the arms Buthelezi has been getting in his capacity as Minister of Police of the KwaZulu homeland are being channelled through the Nkata organization.

Thirdly, the migrant labour system created by the apartheid system, which has led to the creation of the hostels in areas outside the bantustans, has also led to the creation of hostels as islands within the community. This has given rise to the kind of tribal conflicts the régime has always attempted to promote in the country allowing it to appear as a peacemaker.

These and some other factors in the report we prepared inside the country are among the major causes of the conflict in the country, which is, of course, fanned by the régime. Another factor we have discovered through our own experience of the causes of violence in the country is the attempt by some sectors to impose hegemony through the use of force. In that regard, the Pan Africanist Congress has maintained, particularly during the period of the Congress of the Oppressed, that it is incumbent upon us to create in our country a democratic climate, or a culture of democracy, within the oppressed majority. We must accept the principle that there are other political tendencies in the country and that every political tendency in our country must have the legitimate right to put forward its policies and programmes without coercion and without intimidation. But we must also make it clear that no one must be allowed to promote racism or ethnicity.

We believe that a heroic attempt must be made to create a democratic climate within our country and to halt those who wish to impose hegemony through the use of force or by any other means.

(Mr. Ebrahim, PAC)

In that regard, I should like to point out that the President of the Pan Africanist Congress, Comrade Zephania Mothopeng, has taken steps to call upon those who are engaged in the "senseless carnage", as he put it, to do everything in their power to end it as soon as possible. He has also offered to mediate if it should be difficult for them to resolve it themselves. In that regard, we can say that the offer of mediation by the Pan Africanist Congress - since we are not directly involved - still stands, and we hope it will be utilized.

We are convinced that it is possible to end the violence in our country. It is also possible to create the democratic culture we are talking about within the oppressed majority in our country. What is required is the leadership, the will and the commitment. In that regard the Pan Africanist Congress will play its role in bringing this about.

I want to inform the Committee that for some time there have been a number of people concerned about the position of the Pan Africanist Congress vis-à-vis the current developments, and the so-called euphoria of negotiations that is seen in apartheid South Africa. The PAC, from the very outset, took the position it takes today: that what has to be negotiated in apartheid South Africa is not apartheid. Nor does the PAC subscribe to the formulation that apartheid has to be dismantled, because our understanding of the word dismantle is carefully separating the various components and putting them aside. As one of our fighters has pointed out, if he is given a gun and is asked to dismantle it, he has to make sure he takes out the various parts of the gun very carefully. Should he destroy any part of it in the process, he is quite likely to be court-martialled. We do not want anyone in our country to come back subsequently and put those parts back together. So we are not talking about dismantling apartheid; we are talking about eradicating the evil system of apartheid.

(Mr. Ebrahim, PAC)

We continue to maintain that apartheid cannot be reformed; it must be totally eradicated. We also maintain that the genuine vehicle for change in our country can never be the régime, but must rather be the oppressed and dispossessed majority. It is they who must be prepared; their capacity to resist and to fight must be strengthened at all levels: ideologically, organizationally and militarily.

I want to say that the South African racist régime for a period of time has been attempting to make contact with the Pan Africanist Congress. They have used several Western Governments to contact us. We have made it abundantly clear to the South African racist régime and to those emissaries they send to Dar-es-Salaam and elsewhere that if the régime wants to talk to the Pan Africanist Congress it must do so in writing and, secondly, must do so without any pre-conditions. We must say that last month our President received a letter from the South African Administration calling on the PAC to talk to the régime on an exploratory basis. The document said that the PAC had been invited unconditionally to talk to the régime, not for negotiations but in exploratory talks to ascertain the position.

The Pan Africanist Congress, because it is a democratic organization, correctly decided that this letter should be widely discussed at the grass-roots level of the organization, both internally and externally. That process is currently going on. It is the membership which will give the verdict on how the Pan Africanist Congress will respond to the letter. But a general consensus has already arisen as a result of this debate. If the régime wants to inform us of what it thinks, we should accord it the right at least to tell us what it thinks. We should also utilize the opportunity to tell the régime what we think. We believe this is what any serious organization would do.

(Mr. Ebrahim, PAC)

But there is a problem that still has to be overcome, namely the composition of the delegation of the Pan Africanist Congress that would participate in the meeting - if the meeting takes place at all. The PAC will insist, first, that the composition of the delegation will be decided solely by the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania itself.

(Mr. Ebrahim, PAC)

Secondly, if members from the external wing of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC) are to be included in that delegation then the members who would be going as part of that delegation must be granted permanent indemnity. The PAC will reject temporary indemnity because since we are in the process of creating a conducive climate we do not believe that the régime should on the one hand claim that it wants to talk and enter into exploratory talks and at the same time keep a sword of Damocles hanging over the persons it wishes to talk to. We will therefore insist that there should be a permanent indemnity granted to those people

Lastly, I wish to take this opportunity to say that we have utilized the period under review to strengthen our structures inside the country and externally. We have taken a decision that the internal structures will remain as they are, for there are no fundamental changes that have taken place in apartheid South Africa. We have also taken the decision that we must democratize the organization, and that has been done at the grass-roots level. We are now coming to 19, 20 and 21 October, when the Pan Africanist Conference will hold its first national congress in 30 years inside the country, and the delegates to that conference will come from throughout the country. We are expecting between 2,500 and 3,000 delegates, representing organized branches and regions in the country.

In conclusion we wish to state here that this meeting has been specifically called to review the provisions contained in the United Nations consensus resolution: Has the racist régime met or complied with the pre-conditions that have been laid down to create a conducive climate in apartheid South Africa? The report of the Secretary-General is very clear on that: there have not been substantial changes in apartheid South Africa. Even those actions of the régime

(Mr. Ebrahim, PAC)

that we have called upon it to withdraw have not been withdrawn fully, and the régime is apparently reluctant to do so with regard to others. We therefore believe that all forms of pressure and measures, including the armed struggle against the apartheid régime, must be sustained as of now if we are to end that system in a relatively short period of time.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon Mr. Tebogo Mafole, representative of the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC).

Mr. MAFOLE (African National Congress of South Africa (ANC): It is very pertinent and, indeed, highly appropriate that as the United Nations seeks to determine the apartheid régime's response to the historic consensus United Nations Declaration on Apartheid and its Destructive Consequences in Southern Africa the non-governmental organizations be given an opportunity to exercise their judgement. This is so not only because the non-governmental organizations have over the years played a prominent role in the anti-apartheid struggle but also because in the majority of cases it is thanks to their tireless and painstaking efforts that their respective Governments have been obliged to assume militant anti-apartheid postures. In this regard it is hardly surprising that public opinion in the United States, for instance, has compelled the United States Congress to adopt the most far-reaching anti-apartheid legislation, overriding the veto of a very conservative Administration. The African National Congress therefore remains indebted to the Special Political Committee for this opportunity to participate in these hearings.

It is our understanding that the purpose of these hearings is to enable the non-governmental organizations to pronounce themselves on the issues facing the resumed forty-fourth session of the General Assembly, namely, the policies of apartheid. More specifically, we are called upon to determine whether the South

(Mr. Mafole, ANC)

African régime has complied with the requirements of the United Nations Declaration at all, if it has complied, to what extent, and, if not, what should the response of the international community be? These, in our view, are the basic questions that are facing this meeting.

For us in the ANC, the issues are crystal clear. In order to make a determination we have used the Declaration itself as the litmus test. In particular we have very carefully considered the relevant paragraphs of the Declaration in terms of which the apartheid régime is called upon to carry out specific obligations in order to create the necessary climate for negotiations.

In arriving at our conclusions we have been greatly assisted by the United Nations Secretary-General's report, as well as by the report of the monitoring group, the Ad Hoc Committee on Southern Africa, of the Organization of African Unity. Above all, however, we have relied on our own examination of facts on the ground in South Africa. In our view, in spite of what the pro-apartheid lobby and other apologists of apartheid may want to say, the truth is inescapable: the apartheid régime has dismally failed to comply with the requirements of the Declaration.

Let us examine the record. Paragraph 6 (a) of the Declaration requires that the South African régime release all political prisoners and detainees unconditionally and to refrain from imposing any restrctions on them. While it may be argued that a number of political prisoners have been released since 2 February 1990, their number in actual fact constitutes a tiny fraction of the political prisoners incarcerated in apartheid gaols. Indeed, there exists a wide disparity in the figures for political prisoners given by the régime and those given by observers such as human-rights activists and human-rights sources. The fact that there have been discussions between the ANC and the apartheid régime on the issue of political prisoners and the fact that under the terms of both the

(Mr. Mafole, ANC)

Groote Schuur and Pretoria agreements a timetable has been provided for the release of political prisoners should not be viewed as an indication that Pretoria has in deed and in fact complied with that requirement. The truth of the matter is that in spite of the agreed timetable political prisoners in their thousands are still in goals in South Africa. Furthermore, it should also be pointed out that the continued existence of such legislation as the Internal Security Act, which has been designed to circumscribe political activity, has made it possible for the Government to detain even greater numbers of people across the country, including the leaders of the African National Congress. We are therefore saying that while political prisoners have been released the number released does not in fact constitute the kind of numbers that the United Nations Declaration had in mind when it referred to political prisoners, because the Declaration is very clear on that issue and it says that all political prisoners must be released.

(Mr. Mafole, ANC)

To say there is a timetable that is in place - one that may range from any period - does not in itself mean that the political prisoners have been released. Therefore, we take very strong exception to anybody wanting to suggest that because of those agreements the apartheid régime would have complied with the requirements of the Declaration on that score.

Furthermore, the fact that the state of emergency remains in force in Natal and that some emergency measures are applicable in the Transvaal area has given the régime an excuse to detain even more people. In other words, what we are experiencing here is a situation in which the régime is saying on the one hand that in terms of the agreement it is releasing political prisoners but at the same time, in the interest of maintaining law and order, and because of the applications of the provisions of the state of emergency in Natal and elsewhere, it is duty-bound to continue to incarcerate more political prisoners or more detainees.

In our view, this is typical of the South African régime, which is as usual giving with one hand and taking away with the other. It should therefore not in any way delude international public opinion into thinking that there has been any significant movement in that direction. We are thus saying that while there appears on the surface to be a liberalization of the régime, in reality there are still thousands of patriots languishing in apartheid dungeons precisely because they have dared to oppose apartheid.

Leaving aside the question of political prisoners, paragraph 6 (b) of the United Nations Declaration requires the Pretoria régime to lift the ban on all proscribed and restricted organizations and persons. Again, while it is true that on 2 February 1990 De Klerk issued a statement before Parliament in South Africa in which he announced the unbanning of the political organizations, the truth of the matter is that it is in fact well nigh impossible for those political organizations to function in contemporary South Africa.

(Mr. Mafole, ANC)

That is precisely because the South African régime has refused to ensure safe conduct for those members of political organizations who are in exile to participate in the political process in South Africa. Again, we need to be very careful here in using the agreements that have been reached as an excuse to say that the South African regime has in fact delivered the goods. As of now, the political organizations, although technically declared legal, have in actual fact found it impossible to participate in the process.

Paragraphs 6 (c) and 6 (d) of the Declaration address the issue of the need in South Africa to create a political climate that is free of violence. The truth of the matter in present-day South Africa is that we are engulfed in a spiral of violence which the apologists of apartheid have characterized variously as black-on-black violence, sometimes as inter-tribal friction, and at other times as Inkatha versus the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC), and so on. The truth is that behind the facade of those very unhelpful characterizations there is irrefutable evidence of the complicity of the South African police not only in fomenting but also encouraging the conflict.

I believe this to be a very important point of which the international community ought to be apprised, because in the debates that are going on about what is currently occurring in South Africa, we are very often sidetracked from what the Declaration itself requires in South Africa and of the South African Government as an important yardstick that has to be used to determine whether the South African Government has in fact complied with the Declaration. What we find are all kinds of red herrings that are thrown across the path in an effort to characterize the ANC as the aggressor in the violence that is at present engulfing South Africa.

It is also very interesting to note that this kind of characterization comes at a time when the ANC has in fact taken a decision to suspend its armed struggle. It is therefore quite interesting to note that precisely at the point when the ANC

(Mr. Mafole, ANC)

is supposed to have suspended armed struggle it is being accused of continuing the conflict. It does not matter what the rationalization is. The truth of the matter is that behind the conflict there is no denying the direct involvement and complicity of the South African Government.

Not too long ago, the religious delegation led by Archbishop Desmond Tutu met with De Klerk and presented him with sworn affidavits as evidence pointing to the direct involvement of the South African police. What De Klerk has done is merely to give an undertaking that an investigation will be conducted in order to determine this. There have also been eyewitness accounts of white people driving around the township of Soweto and elsewhere having painted themselves black and going on shooting rampages in order to provoke the kind of conflict that we find existing here. We have seen a statement from the police that acknowledges the existence of those kind of vehicles. Of course, the only point they are denying is that the white people painted themselves black in order to give the impression of being black, so as to give a justification of black-on-black violence.

We feel very strongly about this precisely because throughout the years the South African régime has been known to be the sole bearer of responsibility for the conflict that has been raging not only in South Africa but in all of southern Africa and there have been numerous studies undertaken to show the devastation that has occurred precisely because of the policies of the apartheid régime. Suddenly, we are now given to understand that the South African Government is the sole bearer of peace and that the people who are on the receiving end of the violence are supposed to be the ones who are starting that violence and encouraging it.

We believe that this is totally unacceptable and flies in the face of contemporary reality in southern Africa. We would therefore like to make the point that it is neither the ANC nor the people of South Africa that stand to gain in a

(Mr. Mafole, ANC)

situation of continued violence in South Africa. Therefore, the ANC can have no interest in ensuring that our own people, who have been shedding blood over the years in order to get rid of apartheid, would want to continue the violence. I therefore require that the international community place the blame squarely where it is supposed to be placed, that is, on the South African Government.

It is also very interesting that over the years the South African Government has been able to utilize its huge military arsenal in order to keep in check any kind of protest movement in South Africa, including the shooting of unarmed children. And yet, in a situation where arms of devastation are being passed out among thousands and thousands of people, the South African Government now seems totally unable to keep this in check. We refuse to believe that there is no way in which the South African Government could have taken its responsibility on this issue.

(Mr. Mafole, ANC)

That is why, in the light of this, the religious delegation that was headed by Desmond Tutu required that De Klerk set up a permanent judicial commission of inquiry to establish and to investigate the violence, beginning with the shootings in Sebokeng; it requested the Government to act to purge the police and the South African Defence Force of those elements that were in fact set on de-railing the peace process that is under way; it requested that independent monitors, including judges, lawyers, community activists and church leaders accompany security forces who were acting in situations of unrest; and, finally, it requested that a new unit of the security forces be created to handle unrest and be recruited on such a basis as to ensure it was respected by the black community.

Those are not positions of the ANC; they are the positions of the religious leaders that have gone and presented these depositions to the De Klerk régime precisely because of their analysis of the situation and their deep understanding of the actual role and complicity of the South African Government.

What has come from the South African Government as a response to these overtures - the ANC's suspending violence and the calls for the Government to take action against the police? We find that the South African Government has in fact moved a step further in order to intensify the conflict. Not too long ago, an amendment to an existing law was introduced in Natal allowing for the carrying of what is called traditional weapons by the traditional Zulu people, which in fact means that, whereas in the past there may have been laws that prohibited the carrying of weapons, the South African Government has now legitimized it on the grounds that it is in fact observing the cultural traditions of the Zulu people and allowing them to carry whatever weapons they wish to carry. This is, in our view, a way of in fact contributing to an existing situation that is highly explosive. It is not very helpful at all, and that is why it ought to be very clear to the international community where responsibility for the violence lies.

(Mr. Mafole, ANC)

Stepping aside from the violence in South Africa, given the litmus test we are supposed to utilize in determining whether the South African Government has in fact met the requirements, what would be the verdict of the African National Congress? Indeed, what would be the verdict of the international community?

For us, the conclusion is inescapable that there is no way in which anybody can suggest - though there will be such suggestions - that there have been changes, that there have been important developments, that there have been positive developments and that therefore the South African Government ought to be given a chance and we need not, in the old tradition of the United Nations, use its forum to whip the South African Government. We know why such arguments are going to be advanced. The reason is that there is a concerted effort on the part of certain Governments to reward South Africa for what is happening in South Africa and to allow it to take its seat in the General Assembly. Those who advanced such arguments would not be doing so because they were convinced anything was happening in South Africa that warranted actions against South Africa being suspended. It would merely be because they in fact wanted to play as lobbyists of the South African Government in allowing circumstances to come about in which South Africa could be reintegrated, or perhaps sneaked into, the international community through the back door.

We cannot allow such things to happen. We do not think it would be very helpful for the United Nations, after having taken a very firm position that was codified in the United Nations declaration, to turn around, on the basis of what South Africa promises to do, and reduce the existing pressure on South Africa.

In our view, therefore, the verdict is a very clear one, and it is that South Africa has not been able to meet the requirements of the declaration. Having reached that conclusion, the other conclusion is inescapable: that therefore it

(Mr. Mafole, ANC)

ought to be the position of the international community that those measures that are currently in place against the South African Government should in fact remain in place, if not be intensified, because, as we have all agreed, over the years, in fact over four decades, the United Nations has passed resolution after resolution condemning apartheid, but over those decades the apartheid régime has continued to exist to the detriment of the majority of the South African people. The only time the South African Government was able to act in a responsive manner as desired by the international community and the majority of the people of South Africa was when pressure was brought to bear on it. That is the kind of language that has in fact, in our view, assisted tremendously in the attainment of independence by Namibia and in ensuring that South Africa gets to the negotiating table. It is therefore our view that it would be totally incorrect at this stage, after all the pressures that have been brought to bear on it, to let the South African Government off the hook and in fact allow it to buy more time in which to strengthen apartheid, even though it is perhaps given a face-lift. What we are interested in is not an amelioration of the situation in South Africa but an end to apartheid.

On the question of the reintegration of South Africa into the international community, again I think we need to underline what is already contained in the declaration: that only a new South Africa will be allowed to enter and take its place in the international community. In other words, only when a new constitution has been adopted in South Africa will the new South Africa be enabled to take part in international affairs on an equal footing.

Having said that, we also wish to make an appeal to the international community, an appeal we have made over the years but becomes very pertinent at this stage. Over the years we have always said that while it is important for the international community to adopt a very firm position against the apartheid régime,

(Mr. Mafole, ANC)

what is ultimately going to be very important and prove more useful, particularly for the people of South Africa, is a situation in which those people will have been rendered the kind of assistance they require to ensure they will rid themselves of the scourge of apartheid.

Under these circumstances, we wish to say that in South Africa we are now faced with a situation in which, starting from 1 October, something in the order of 20,000 political exiles will be going back into South Africa, into a situation in which the economy has been devastated, particularly through the imposition of sanctions, and therefore in a situation in which a great deal of assistance will be required for those who want to be reintegrated into the South African community and to take part in the political process.

To that end, in South Africa there has been created a co-ordinating body intended to receive political exiles. It is comprised of the various political organizations, the South African Council of Churches, the trade union movement and other service organizations such as the Health Workers Educationists. The purpose of this Committee is in fact to ensure that those who will hopefully be coming out of prisons in their thousands will be enabled to take their place within the community and be properly integrated. It is also this Committee's task to ensure that those who are coming from outside the boundaries of South Africa, with their children and so forth, into situations in which the educational system for black people has been in virtual stagnation, will be enabled to be given the educational facilities they require.

(Mr. Mafole, ANC)

We are therefore making an appeal to the international community, and in particular to the various bodies and specialized agencies of the United Nations, including the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), and others, for assistance in this direction. We understand that a number of these bodies have expressed some concern over this, to the effect that such assistance might be seen as participation in South Africa and in violation of United Nations sanctions. The point I should like to make, however, is that the assistance that they would provide would in fact be assistance that had been enjoyed by the liberation movement previously, and nobody is calling for the actual involvement of these United Nations bodies in South Africa itself but for them simply to recognize that the situation deserves the kind of concerted assistance that the United Nations can provide in this direction.

Hence, coupled with a very strong insistence on the need to maintain existing sanctions against South Africa, we would also like to make a very fervent appeal to the international community to provide precisely the kind of assistance that would enable those South Africans, either in prison or elsewhere outside the boundaries of South Africa, to participate in a process which has in fact been envisaged by the United Nations - in other words, to address the question of resolving South Africa's problems by peaceful means.

We are committed to the cause of resolving South Africa's problems by peaceful means. Many people have in fact wanted to project this as a tactical move on the part of the ANC. We wish to go on record as stating very categorically that it is a position that we have taken after a very careful assessement and analysis of our situation, and we think that it is a position that has been taken in the best interests of our people.

(Mr. Mafole, ANC)

Having said that, we would also like to reiterate what the Deputy President of the ANC, Nelson Mandela, said at the recent Ad hoc Committee meeting of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) in Kampala to the effect that, if the South African Government continues to utilize a situation in which the ANC has suspended violence in order to foment and encourage violence, this might leave the ANC with no option but to exercise its right, and the right of the people of South Africa, to self-defence. But we wamt to make the point that for South Africa to move in the direction envisaged by the United Nations Declaration it is critical that at this stage the international community maintain the sanctions that were so necessary to get South Africa to the negotiating table in the first place.

We should like to conclude by saying that as far as the ANC is concerned the struggle continues, and until such time as we can rid not only South Africa but the entire African continent of the scourge of apartheid, we shall not rest and we shall ensure that the support we have received over the years from the international community has not been in vain but will in fact lead to a transformation in South Africa, a transformation in which the people of South Africa shall together determine their own destiny in a democratic fashion, irrespective of their colour, creed or other considerations.

The CHAIRMAN: We have heard the last speaker on our list. The Special Political Committee has thus concluded its consideration of agenda item 28 and the Rapporteur will present the Committee's report to the General Assembly.

At the conclusion of the meeting, I should like to thank the representatives of the non-governmental organizations who have been present at this meeting today and who have made very important contributions to the deliberations of the Committee.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.